Appendix 1: Full transcript of notes of a speech by Winston Churchill broadcast on BBC radio, 10pm, 15 November 1934 (LG/G/4/5/7):

I have but a short time to deal with this enormous subject and I beg you therefore to weigh my words with the attention and thought which I have given to them. As we go to and fro in this peaceful country with its decent orderly people going about their business under free institutions and with so much tolerance and fairplay in their laws and customs, it is startling and fearful to realise that we are no longer safe in our island home. For nearly one thousand years England has never seen camp fires of an invader, the stormy seas and our Royal Navy have been our sure defence. Not only have we preserved our life and freedom through the centuries, but gradually we have come to be the heart and centre of an Empire which surrounds the globe. It is indeed with a pang of stabbing pain that we see all this in mortal danger. A thousand years has been spent to form a State; an hour may lay it in the dust. What shall we do? Many people think that the best way to escape war is to dwell upon its horrors and to imprint them vividly upon the minds of the younger generation. They flaunt the grizzly photographs before their eyes. They fill their ears with tales of carnage; they dilate upon the ineptitude of Generals and Admirals; they denounce the crime and insensate folly of human strife. Now all this teaching ought to be very useful in preventing us from attacking or invading any other country. It seems to me no one outside a mad house would wish to do so. But how would it help us if we were attacked or invaded ourself? That is what we have to ask. Would the invaders visit Lord Beaverbrooks exhibition, or listen to the impassioned appeals of Mr. Lloyd George. Would they meet that famous South African General Smuts and have their inferiority complex removed in friendly debate? I doubt it. I have borne responsibility for the safety of this country in grievous times; I gravely doubt it. But even if they did, I am not so sure we should convince them and persuade them to go back quietly home. They might say: You are rich, we are poor; you seem well fed; we are hungry. You have been victorious; we have been defeated. You have valuable colonies; we have none. You have your Navy, where is ours. You had the past; let us have the future. Above all I fear they would say: You are weak, and we are strong. After all, my friends, only a few hours away by air there dwells a nation of nearly 70 millions of the most educated, industrious scientific people in the world, who are being taught from childhood to think of war as a glorious exercise and death in battle as the noblest deed for man. There is a nation which has abandoned all its liberties in order to augment its collective strength. There is a nation which with all its strength and virtue is in the grip of a group of ruthless men preaching a gospel of intolerance and racial pride unrestrained by law by Parliament or by public opinion. In that country all pacifist speeches, all morbid books, are forbidden or suppressed and the authors rigorously imprisoned. From their new table of commandments they have omitted: Thou shalt not kill. It is but 20 years since these neighbours of ours fought almost the whole world and almost defeated them. Now they are re-arming with the utmost speed. And ready to their hands is this new lamentable weapon of the air against which a Navy has no defence and before which women and children, the weak and the frail, the pacifist and the jingo, the warrior and the civilian, the front line trenches and the cottage home all lie in equal peril. Nay, worse still, for with the new weapon has come a new method, or has come back the most brutish method of ancient barbarism – the possibility of compelling the submission of races by torturing their civil population. And worst of all, the more civilised the country is, the larger, more splendid its cities, the more intricate the structure of its social and economic

life, the more it is vulnerable, the more it is at the mercy of those who may make it their prey. These are facts. Hard grim, indisputable facts, and in face of these facts, I ask again, What are we to do?

There are those who say: Let us ignore the Continent of Europe. Let us leave it with its hatreds and armaments to stew in its own juice, to fight out its own quarrels. Let us turn our backs upon this alarming scene. Let us fix our gaze across the ocean and lead our own life in the midst of our peace-loving dominions and empire. There is much to be said for this plan if only we could unfasten the British islands from their rock foundations and could tow them 3,000 miles across the Atlantic Ocean and anchor them safely upon the smiling coasts of Canada. I have not heard of any way in which this could be done. No engineer has come forward with any scheme; even our best scientists are dumb. It would certainly in any case take a long time. Have we got a long time? At present we lie within a few minutes' striking distance of the French, Dutch and Belgian coasts, and within a few hours of the great aerodromes of Central Europe. We are even within cannon shot of the Continent. Is it prudent? Is it possible, however we might desire it, to turn our backs upon Europe and ignore whatever may happen there. Everyone can judge this question for himself. And everyone ought to make up his mind, or her mind, about it, without delay. It lies at the heart of our problem.

For my part I have come to the conclusion reluctantly I admit that we cannot get away. Here we are. We must make the best of it, but do not, I beg you, underrate the risks, the grievous risks, we have to run. I hope, I pray, and on the whole, grasping the larger hope, I believe that no war will fall upon us. But if in the near future the great war of 1914 is resumed again in Europe after the armistice, for that is what it may come to under different conditions, in different combinations no doubt, if that should happen no one can tell where and how it would end. Or whether sooner or later we should not be dragged into it, as the U.S.A. were dragged in against their will in 1917. Whatever happened, and whatever we did, it would be a time of frightful danger for us. When the war was over, or perhaps while it still raged, we should be brought face to face with the victors, whoever they might be. Indeed, with our wealth and vast possessions, we should be the only prize sufficiently attractive for their exertions and to compensate them for their loss. Then certainly those who had disregarded Europe would have to turn round very quickly indeed, and then it would be too late. Therefore it seems to me that we cannot detach ourselves from Europe, and that for our own safety and self-preservation we are bound to make exertions and run risks for the sake of keeping peace. There are some who say, indeed it has been the shrill cry of the hour, we should run the risk of disarming ourselves in order to set an example to others. We have done that already. Done it for the last five years. Our example has not been followed. On the contrary, it has produced, as I ventured to predict, the opposite result. All the other countries have armed the more heavily and the quarrels and intrigues about disarmament have only bred more ill-will between the nations. Every one would be glad to see the burden of armaments reduced in every country, but history shows on many a page that armaments are not necessarily a cause of war. Want of them has been no guarantee of peace. If for instance all the explosives all over the world could by a wave of magic wand be robbed of their power and made harmless so that not a cannon [or] rifle could fire and not a shell or bomb detonate, that would be a measure of world disarmament far beyond the brightest dreams of Geneva, but would it ensure peace? That is the question. On the contrary, in my belief war would begin almost the next day, when enormous masses of fierce men armed with picks and spades or soon with clubs and spears, would pour over the frontiers and would be furiously resisted by the local populations and those who went to their aid. This truth may be unfashionable, unpalatable, no doubt unpopular, but it is the truth. The story of mankind shows that war was universal and unceasing for millions of years before armaments were invented or armies organised. Indeed, the intervals of peace and order only occur in human history after armaments in the hands of strong governments have come into being and civilisation in every age has been nursed only in cradles guarded by superior weapons and superior discipline. To remove the causes of war we must go deeper than armaments. Remove grievances and injustice, raise human thought to a higher plain; we must give a new inspiration to the world. Let moral disarmament come, and physical disarmament will soon follow. But what sign of this is there now? When we look out upon the state of Europe and of the world and of the position of our own country as they are tonight, it seems to me that the next year or the next two years may contain a fateful turning point in our history. I am afraid if you look intently at what is

moving towards Great Britain, you will see that the only choice open is the old grim choice our forbears had to face, namely, whether we shall submit or whether we shall prepare. Whether we shall submit to the will of a stronger nation or whether we shall prepare to defend our rights, liberties and indeed our lives. If we submit our submission should be timely. If we prepare our preparation should not be too late. Submission will entail at the very least the passing and destruction of the British Empire, and the acceptance by our people within and under a Teutonic domination of Europe of whatever future may be in store for small countries like Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Belgium and Switzerland. The difficulty about submission I state it calmly, the difficulty is that we have already in this land, the population of a first-class Power, and on our new scale of life as a model State we could not feed more than perhaps half of those who now live here. Great issues will arise in deciding which half should survive. You have perhaps read the story of the Raft of the Medusa; I will not dwell on that. These are the disadvantages of submission, and of Britain definitely relinquishing her great position in the world. Preparation, on the other hand, involves statesmanship, expense and exertion, and neither submission nor preparation are free from suffering and danger. I should not speak to you my friends, fellow-countrymen, in this way, if I were not prepared to declare to you some of the measures of preparation by which I believe another great war may be averted and our destruction be prevented should war come.

First, we must, without another day's delay, begin to make ourselves at least the strongest Air Power in the European world. By this means we shall recover to a very large extent the safety which we formerly enjoyed through our Navy, and through our being an island. By this means we shall free ourselves from the dangers of being blackmailed against our will either to surrender our possessions and ever hand over such machines of defence as we possess, or of being forced to join in a continental war against our wish, or against our feeling of right and justice, by these means we shall remove from Europe that additional danger to peace which arises when a very wealthy nation and Empire is so obviously undefended that it lies an inviting bait or prey to the ambitions of hungry Powers. That is not all we should do. I look to the League of Nations as being an instrument which properly sustained and guided may preserve the threatened peace of the world. I know it is fashionable in some quarters to attack the League of Nations, but where is there any other equal hope. The many countries, great and small, that are afraid of being absorbed or invaded by Germany, should lay their fears and their facts before the League of Nations. If the League of Nations is satisfied that these fears are justified should call upon its Members to volunteer as special constables for the preservation of peace against a particular danger. Naturally those would be most ready to volunteer whose homes lay nearest the regions where the outbreak was most likely to occur. It might well be that not only two or three nations, but 8 or 10 would be found willing in their own interests and in the interests of peace to undertake this special obligation. There would then come into being within the League of Nations and under its authority, a special service band of nations who are in danger and who want to be let alone. It would be a confederation not merely of the peace-loving Powers, for everyone will say they are that, but peace interested Powers, -- a League of those who have most to lose by war and nearest to the danger. I accept the words which General Smuts used only on Monday last. There should be, he said, a smaller group within the League entering into mutual defensive arrangements, and subject to the control of the League. Those are words of wisdom and it seems to me that Great Britain should not refuse to bear her share and do her part in this. These volunteer special constables should not only be authorised but urged by the League of Nations to concert with one another measures of mutual defence against the invasion of any one of them whether by land sea or air, and to undertake to maintain forces while the danger lasts, which, collectively are so overwhelming, that there is no chance of anyone being attacked.

You have heard the old doctrine of the balance of power. I don't accept it. Anything like a balance of power in Europe will lead to war. Great wars usually come only when both States think they have good hopes of victory. Peace must be founded upon preponderance; there is safety in numbers. If there were 5 or 6 on each side, there might be a frightful trial of strength, but if there were 8 or 10 on one side and only one or two upon the other, and if the collective armed forces on one side were 3 or 4 times as large as the other, then there will be no war. The practical arrangements which are appropriate to one peril and to one region

of the world may be repeated elsewhere in different combinations in other seas, and it might well be that gradually the whole world would be laced with international insurance against individual aggressors and confidence and safety would return to mankind. If the first stage of such a structure should be built up by the League of Nations at the present time, and there may still be time, it would I believe enable us to get through the next 10 years without a horrible and fatal catastrophe, and in that interval, in that blessed breathing space, we might be able to re-construct the life of Europe and re-unite in justice and goodwill our quaking civilisation. May God protect us all.